

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the language “wherein the attachment section includes a first member and a second member swingably engaging with each other in a detachable manner.” This language was previously found in each of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 4. Claims 2-4 have been amended to delete the language put into claim 1. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 9-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Oliver. Claims 2, 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Oliver and Shigeru et al. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Oliver and Maitani et al. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Oliver and Yamaguchi. Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Oliver and further in view of Akira. Claims 3, 4 and 6 were once again objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 3, 4 and 6. However, in view of the amendment to independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 3, 4 and 6 have been maintained in dependent form.

Turning to the applied prior art, the Official Action relies upon Takeshi, Oliver and Shigeru for the limitations now found in claim 1, but previously found in claims 1 and 2.

The Official Action asserts (pages 3 and 4) that Takeshi does not disclose that the attachment section is configured to be mounted on the case in a detachable manner. To overcome this deficiency of Takeshi, the Official Action turns to Oliver for teaching of this limitation. In addition, in the rejection of Claim 2 (which includes language now found in claim 1) the Official Action notes that Takeshi and Oliver do not disclose that the attachment section includes a first member and a second member swingably engaging with each other in a detachable manner. To overcome this deficiency of Takeshi and Oliver, the Official Action turns to Shigeru for teaching of this feature.

Turning first to Takeshi, Applicants note that the reference is directed to an adapter for a teleconversion lens. As shown in Figure 1, Takeshi shows adaptor case 50 which has attached thereto teleconverting lens 60. Lens 60 includes lenses 63-65 which are held in case 61 (see para. 0018 and Fig. 2(a)). Adapter 50 includes adapter case 51 formed in the shape of a cylinder. Screw slot 52a is formed in end face section 52 and is screwed into screw slot 41b of lens section 40 (see paragraphs 0014 and 0017). Zoom lens unit 42, when contracted, is contained in lens stowage 41 (see paragraphs 0020 and 0021). As a result of the use of adaptor 50 along with teleconversion lens 60, the adaptor 50 and teleconverting lens 60 as shown in Figure 1 of the drawing show adaptor 50 covering the zoom lens 42 when the zoom lens 42 is in an expanded position, (see para. 19 and Fig. 2(a)). Thus, Takeshi shows an adaptor and tele conversion lens unit for covering a zoom lens unit when the zoom lens unit is in an expanded position.

Turning next to Oliver, the Official Action refers to Figure 13 of Oliver for an attachment section mounted on the camera in a detachable manner. From Applicant's review of Fig. 13 of Oliver, Applicant finds that the attachment section slides onto the camera from a side of the camera. However, because in Takeshi, adaptor 50 is configured to fit over zoom lens 42 by being placed over the lens, when the lens is in an expanded position, and slid into

a secured position in lens stowage 41, Applicants find that the configuration and operation of the adapter of Takeshi would be destroyed if the adapter was slid in from the side. In addition, it would not have been possible to slide the adapter into the case of Takeshi from the side when zoom lens 42 is in an expended position because zoom lens 42, as well as stowage unit 41, stick out from the front of the case of the camera, thus preventing the adapter from being slid onto the camera from the side.

Turning to Shigeru, Applicants note that Shigeru discloses a camera cover that protects the camera such that no dust or water reaches the camera. In this regard, Shigeru shows in Figure 1 a camera covering 110 fully enclosing the camera 10. Further, Shigeru shows in Figure 3 that the camera covering 110 together with lens protection unit 152 and filter 160 fully enclose camera in order to waterproof and dustproof camera 10. Thus, Applicants find that Shigeru is directed to a cover for a camera to prevent dust and water from getting into the camera. Even if, assuming *arguendo*, that an artisan would have been motivated to add the camera case of Shigeru to the camera of Takeshi, this would not have resulted in the invention recited in claim 1 because the case of Shigeru would not have suggested making the adapter of Takeshi out of pieces that are detachable and swingably engagable with each other.

From all of the above, Applicants find that the combination of references as advanced in the Official Action would have been a hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' invention, and not a combination of elements suggested by the references to Takeshi, Oliver and Shigeru.


In light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,000